

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/811,095	LEE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	B. James Peikari	2189	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) B. James Peikari (USPTO). (3) _____.
 (2) Shannen C. Delaney (#51,605). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 13 September 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-8 and 17-40.

Identification of prior art discussed: Takeda et al., U.S. 7,003,634.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The parties agreed to an amendment to direct claim 27 to a "storage device" wherein the device or computer execute the program instructions, to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 101. The parties also agreed to adding a dedicated "proxy port" to claims 28 and 35 to overcome the rejections based on the Takeda et al. reference. Applicant agreed to submit a proposed amendment including to agreed-upon changes for the examiner to attach to an Examiner's Amendment.